arXiv:hep-ph/9510418v1 26 Oct 1995

Q^2 Dependence of the Bjorken Sum Rule[1]

Lech Mankiewicz[†], Eckart Stein[††], and Andreas Schäfer[††]

[†] *Institut for Theoretical Physics, TU-München, Germany* [2]
[††] *Institut for Theoretical Physics, J.W. Goethe Universität Frankfurt, Germany*

Abstract

We discuss various estimates of the magnitude of higher-twist corrections to the Bjorken sum rule in polarized deep inelastic scattering.

[1]Talk given by L.M. at the 'Workshop on the prospects of spin physics at HERA', DESY-Zeuthen, August 28-31, 1995

[2]On leave of absence from N.Copernicus Astronomical Center, Warsaw, Poland

Considerable attention has been paid to measurements of the polarized structure function g_1 in deep inelastic scattering. The unexpected EMC [1] results for the first moment of g_1^p, the structure function of the proton, invoked tremendous effort to gain more knowledge about polarized scattering. As a result of these intense discussions it became clear that polarization phenomena might offer much better opportunities to test QCD than unpolarized experiments. Meanwhile SMC [2] and SLAC [3] experiments have provided data on g_1^n and much improved ones on g_1^p. Mainly due to this experiments the general interest shifted to related questions most notably to the problem of Q^2 dependence. It turned out that an estimate of the magnitude of higher twist contributions is urgently needed in order to compare the experiments of SLAC, SMC and EMC which cover different Q^2 regions [4]. This is especially important for the SLAC data which correspond to Q^2 around 2 GeV^2.

The first moment of $g_1(x, Q^2)$ at fixed Q^2 is given by [5]

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^1 dx\ g_1(x,Q^2) &= \frac{1}{2}a^{(0)} + \frac{m_N^2}{9Q^2}\left(a^{(2)} + 4d^{(2)} + 4f^{(2)}\right) + O(\frac{m_N^4}{Q^4}) \\ &\equiv \frac{1}{2}a^{(0)} + \mu\frac{GeV^2}{Q^2} + O(\frac{m_N^4}{Q^4})\ . \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The above formula does not include perturbative corrections (QCD). Higher order corrections were recently calculated in the leading twist approximation up to $O(\alpha_S^3)$ for non-singlet quantities, the Bjorken sum rule and – up to $O(\alpha_S^2)$ – for the Ellis-Jaffe sum rule [6]. The Ellis-Jaffe sum rule has a flavour singlet contribution.

The reduced matrix elements for the twist-3 and twist-4 components of Eq. (1) are defined by:

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{6}\langle pS|\bar{q}(0)\left[\gamma^\alpha g\tilde{G}^{\beta\sigma} + \gamma^\beta g\tilde{G}^{\alpha\sigma}\right]q(0)|pS\rangle - \text{traces} = \\ &= 2d^{(2)}\left[\frac{1}{6}\left(2p^\alpha p^\beta S^\sigma + 2p^\beta p^\alpha S^\sigma - p^\beta p^\sigma S^\alpha - p^\alpha p^\sigma S^\beta - p^\sigma p^\alpha S^\beta - p^\sigma p^\beta S^\alpha\right)\right. \\ &\left. -\text{traces}\right]\ , \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

and

$$\langle pS|\bar{q}(0)g\tilde{G}_{\alpha\beta}\gamma^\beta q(0)|pS\rangle = 2m_N^2 f^{(2)} S_\alpha \tag{3}$$

respectively, where $|pS\rangle$ represents the nucleon state of momentum p and spin S, $S^2 = -m_N^2$. Note that renormalisation leads to the scale dependence of the matrix elements $d^{(2)}$ and $f^{(2)}$. The appropriate scale is given by the value of Q^2, or the virtuality of the photon probe.

The reduced matrix elements $d^{(2)}$ and $a^{(2)}$ can be expressed through the second moments of the polarized nucleon structure functions $g_1(x)$ and $g_2(x)$ [7]:

$$\begin{aligned}\int dx\ x^2 g_2(x) &= \frac{1}{3}\left(d^{(2)} - a^{(2)}\right) \\ \int dx\ x^2 g_1(x) &= \frac{1}{2}\ a^{(2)} \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

While $a^{(2)}$ may be obtained from existing data in a straightforward way, experimental determination of $d^{(2)}$ requires high-precision measurement of the $g_2(x)$ structure function and is much more complicated.

On the theoretical side the higher-twist matrix elements can be estimated either with the help of available non-perturbative methods, such as QCD sum rules or ultimately the lattice QCD calculation, or within relativistic quark models, such as the MIT bag model.

In the usual approach nucleon matrix elements of local operators can be extracted from a three-point correlation function

$$\Pi_\Gamma(p) = i^2 \int d^4x e^{ipx} \int d^4y \langle 0|T\left\{\eta(x) O_\Gamma(y) \overline{\eta}(0)\right\}|0\rangle \tag{5}$$

which involves an interpolating current $\eta(x)$ with a certain overlap λ between the state created from the vacuum by $\eta(x)$ and the nucleon state

$$\langle 0|\eta(x))|pS\rangle = \lambda u(p,S) \exp\left(ipx\right). \tag{6}$$

The overlap integral can be determined from an additional two-point correlation function

$$\Pi(p) = i \int d^4x e^{ipx} \langle 0|T\left\{\eta(x)\overline{\eta}(0)\right\}|0\rangle\,. \tag{7}$$

In practical application it is often advantageous to consider the ratio of three- and two-point correlation functions such that the λ-dependence cancels out.

For QCD sum rule calculations of nucleon properties the standard choice for $\eta(x)$ has been for a long time the three-quark current introduced by Ioffe [8]

$$\eta_I(x) = \left[u^a(x) C\gamma_\mu u^b(x)\right] \gamma_5 \gamma^\mu d^c(x) \varepsilon^{abc}\,, \tag{8}$$

which was used in the first QCD sum rules calculation of $f^{(2)}$ and $d^{(2)}$ by Balitsky, Braun and Kolesnichenko (BBK) [9].

As it can be seen from (2) and (3), the operators defining $d^{(2)}$ and $f^{(2)}$ explicitly contain the gluonic field operator. This gluonic field has to be matched by another gluonic field operator. Because the three-quark current $\eta_I(x)$ does not contain the gluonic operator explicitly the desired contribution must be generated through the perturbative emission of an additional gluon. The amplitude for this process is proportional to the strong coupling constant g.

Alternatively, one may consider an interpolating field which in addition to three quark fields contains the gluon field explicitly. In that case gluon emission from the three-quark configuration has a non-perturbative character.

A possible construction of an interpolating current with such properties was discussed in [10]. It was noticed that all the nice features of the current in (8) are preserved by making it *nonlocal*, e.g. by shifting the d-quark to the point $x+\epsilon$ (and adding the required gauge factor to preserve gauge invariance). Expanding two times in ϵ and averaging over the directions in Euclidean space $\epsilon_\mu \epsilon_\nu \to \frac{1}{4}\delta_{\mu\nu}\epsilon^2$ one arrives at

$$\eta'_G(x) = \varepsilon^{abc} (u^a(x) C\gamma_\mu u^b(x)) \gamma_5 \gamma_\mu \sigma_{\alpha\beta} \left[\mathrm{g} G^{\alpha\beta}(x) d(x)\right]^c\,. \tag{9}$$

Finally, projecting out the isospin $\frac{1}{2}$ component leads to the following proton interpolating current:

$$\eta_G(x) = \frac{2}{3}\left(\eta_G^{\rm old}(x) - \eta_G^{\rm ex}(x)\right)\,, \tag{10}$$

where

$$\eta_G^{\rm old}(x) = \varepsilon^{abc}\left(u^a(x) C\gamma_\mu u^b(x)\right) \gamma_5 \gamma^\mu \sigma_{\alpha\beta} \left[G^{\alpha\beta}(x) d(x)\right]^c\,, \tag{11}$$

and

$$\eta_G^{\rm ex}(x) = \varepsilon^{abc}\left(u^a(x) C\gamma_\mu d^b(x)\right) \gamma_5 \gamma^\mu \sigma_{\alpha\beta} \left[G^{\alpha\beta}(x) u(x)\right]^c\,. \tag{12}$$

	[11, 12]	[9]	[16]	[17]	[13]	[3, 14, 15]
$d_p^{(2)}$	-0.006 ± 0.003	-0.003 ± 0.006	0.021	0.010	-0.0483 ± 0.0048	0.0054 ± 0.0050
$f_p^{(2)}$	-0.037 ± 0.006	-0.050 ± 0.034	0.035	0.028	—	—
$a_p^{(2)}$	—	—	0.059	—	0.0300 ± 0.0066	0.023 ± 0.014
$d_n^{(2)}$	-0.03 ± 0.01	-0.027 ± 0.012	0	0	-0.0039 ± 0.0027	0.0024 ± 0.019
$f_n^{(2)}$	-0.013 ± 0.006	0.018 ± 0.017	0	0	—	—
$a_n^{(2)}$	—	—	0	0	-0.0027 ± 0.0039	-0.007 ± 0.031

Table 1: Numerical values of higher-twists matrix elements from QCD sum rules [9, 11, 12], the MIT bag model [16, 17], lattice-QCD [13] and experiment [3, 14, 15]. We have extracted value for $d_n^{(2)}$ from the published data as the difference between deuteron and proton measurements $2d_d^{(2)} - d_p^{(2)} = d_n^{(2)}$.

It is appropriate to stress here that the technique of QCD sum rules does not require the use of "the best" current from all the possible ones, it is only necessary that the current is not too bad in order that the contribution of interest is not suppressed by some special reason.

The QCD sum rules calculation with the current (10) is reported in Refs. [11, 12]. Despite significant technical differences between both calculations, the numerical results agree satisfactorily. Note that the numerical value of the theoretical uncertainty quoted in [11, 12] refers only to stability of the sum rule. The additional uncertainty, of order of 50%, stems from assumed hypothesis about factorization of higher dimensional condensates. This uncertainty has been already accounted for in the error estimates presented in [9].

The most promising technique to calculate matrix elements of local operators in QCD is provided, of course, by the lattice formulation. First results for matrix element $d^{(2)}$ have been recently obtained in [13]. The yet unsolved operator mixing problems make at present the lattice calculation of $f^{(2)}$ impossible.

The first experimental measurement of $d^{(2)}$, due to E143 group, has been reported by S. Rock during this conference [14], see also [15]. The data have been taken at average $Q^2 \sim 5$ GeV^2.

MIT bag model estimates are to be found in [16, 17]. Note that due to SU(6) symmetry of the wave function the bag model predicts identically zero for neutron matrix elements. The latter bag model estimate [17] for $d^{(2)}$ was obtained from the former one [16] by the perturbative QCD evolution, starting from a very low scale $\mu_{\rm bag} \sim 0.4$ GeV.

In Table 1 we have summarized various theoretical and experimental estimates of proton (p) and neutron (n) matrix elements which contribute to higher-twist corrections to BSR.

Note that the leading higher-twist matrix elements discussed above describe fundamental properties of the nucleon. The twist-4 operator eq. (3) is a measure for the contribution of the collective gluonic field to the spin of the nucleon. Writing the dual field strength tensor in its components we get

$$\langle pS| - B_A^\sigma j_A^0 + (\vec{j}_A \times \vec{E}_A)^\sigma |pS\rangle = 2m_N^2 f^{(2)} S^\sigma \tag{13}$$

where the quark-current is denoted as $j_A^\mu = -g\bar{q}\gamma^\mu t^A q$ and B_A^σ and E_A^σ are the colour magnetic and colour electric fields. In the rest system of the nucleon an analogous relation holds for the twist-3 operator which determines $d^{(2)}$

$$\langle pS|2B_A^\sigma j_A^0 + (\vec{j}_A \times \vec{E}_A)^\sigma |pS\rangle = 8m_N^2 d^{(2)} S^\sigma \ . \tag{14}$$

Knowledge of $d^{(2)}$ and $f^{(2)}$ then allows to estimate magnetic and electric field contributions to the spin separately. Using results of [11, 12] we find that both colour electric and colour magnetic

	[11, 12]	[9]	[16]	[17]	[18]
$\mu(p-n)$	0.003 ± 0.008	-0.015 ± 0.010	0.027	0.015	—
$\mu(p)$	-0.015 ± 0.007	-0.02 ± 0.013	0.027	0.015	-0.12

Table 2: Different estimates of the numerical values of the coefficients in front of O(GeV^2/Q^2) corrections to Bjorken ($\mu(p-n)$) and Ellis-Jaffe ($\mu(p)$) sum rules, due to QCD sum rules [9, 11, 12], MIT bag model [16, 17] and extrapolation [18] based on Gerasimov-Drell-Hearn sum rule.

fields in the rest system of the nucleon contribute at the same order of magnitude to the spin

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle pS|gB^\sigma u^\dagger u|pS\rangle &= -(0.07 \pm 0.08) m_N^2 S^\sigma \\
\langle pS|gB^\sigma d^\dagger d|pS\rangle &= (0.188 \pm 0.08) m_N^2 S^\sigma \\
\langle pS|\left[(\bar{u}\vec{\gamma}\, u) \times g\vec{E}\,\right]^\sigma |pS\rangle &= (0.09 \pm 0.08) m_N^2 S^\sigma \\
\langle pS|\left[(\bar{d}\vec{\gamma}\, d) \times g\vec{E}\,\right]^\sigma |pS\rangle &= (0.21 \pm 0.08) m_N^2 S^\sigma \ . \qquad (15)
\end{aligned}$$

Obviously such a result shows that simple phenomenological models motivated as analogy to QED are misleading. In any such model one would expect the colour-magnetic term to dominate.

In Table 2 we have summarised various predictions for the coefficient in front of O(GeV^2/Q^2) correction in Eq.(1) for Bjorken ($\mu(p-n)$) and Ellis-Jaffe ($\mu(p)$) sum rules. The last column corresponds to the extrapolation of [18] based on Gerasimov-Drell-Hearn [19, 20] sum rule. It is interesting to observe that contrary to the bag model results, the sum rules predictions point in the direction suggested by the Gerasimov-Drell-Hearn sum rule.

It can be seen that the QCD sum rules and the newest MIT bag model predictions, although different in sign, are consistent as far as the magnitude is concerned. Hence, one can expect that higher-twist effects contribute about 2-3 % of the measured value of the Bjorken sum rule at Q^2 around 5 GeV^2. On the other hand further experimental efforts to determine the power-like Q^2 dependence of the Bjorken integral $\int_0^1 dx g_1^{p-n}(x,Q^2)$ will contribute a lot to our understanding to non-perturbative aspects of QCD.

In the above summary we have purposely omitted discussion of very interesting conceptual problem of uniqueness of the definition of power-suppressed corrections to deep-inelastic sum rules in QCD. The excellent review of this not yet fully understood topic can be found in [21], and references given therein.

Acknowledgments This work was supported in part by BMBF, DFG., and by KBN grant 2 P302 143 06. We are grateful to Vladimir Braun for useful discussions and encouragement.

References

[1] J. Ashman et al., Phys. Lett. **B206** (1988) 364; Nucl. Phys. **328** (1989) 1

[2] B. Adeva et al. Phys. Lett. **B302** (1993) 533

[3] K. Abe et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 346 (1995); Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 25 (1995).

[4] J. Ellis and M. Karliner, Phys. Lett. **B341** (1995) 397.

[5] E.V. Shuryak and A.I. Vainstein, Nucl.Phys. **B199** (1982) 451; Nucl.Phys. **B201** (1982) 141;
B. Ehrnsperger, L. Mankiewicz, and A. Schäfer, Phys.Lett. **B323** (1994) 439.

[6] S.A. Larin, F.V. Tkachev, and J.A.M. Vermaseren, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66** (1991) 862; S.A. Larin and J.A.M. Vermaseren, Phys. Lett. **B 259** (1991) 345.

[7] R.L. Jaffe, Comments Nucl.Part.Phys. **19** (1990) 239.

[8] B.L. Ioffe, Nucl.Phys.**B188** (1981) 317; (E) *ibid.* **B191** (1981) 71.

[9] I.I. Balitsky, V.M. Braun, and A.V. Kolesnichenko, Phys.Lett. **B242** (1990) 245; Phys.Lett. **B318** (1993) 648 (E).

[10] V.M. Braun, P. Górnicki, L. Mankiewicz, and A. Schäfer, Phys.Lett. **302** (1993) 291.

[11] E. Stein, P. Górnicki, L. Mankiewicz, A. Schäfer and W. Greiner, Phys.Lett. **B343** (1995) 369

[12] E. Stein, P. Górnicki, L. Mankiewicz, A. Schäfer, Phys.Lett.**B353**, 107 (1995).

[13] M. Göckeler, R. Horsley, M. Ilgenfritz, H. Perlt, P. Rakow, G. Schierholz, and A. Schiller, *Towards a Lattice Calculation of the Nucleon Structure Functions.*, DESY 94-227, HLRZ 94-64, FUB-HEP-94-15, HUB-IEP-94-30.
Polarized and unpolarized nucleon structure functions from lattice QCD. DESY 95-128, HLRZ 95-36, HUB-EP-95-9.

[14] S.Rock, lecture at this conference.

[15] *Measurements of the Proton and Deuteron Spin Structure Function g_2 and Asymmetry A_2*, E143 Collaboration, K. Abe et al., SLAC-PUB-95-6982, August 1995.

[16] X. Ji and P. Unrau, Phys.Lett. **B333** (1994) 228.

[17] X. Ji, *Polarizabilities of gluon fields in a polarized nucleon.* MIT-CTP-2468, hep-ph/9509288

[18] V.D. Burkert and B.L. Ioffe, Phys.Lett. **B 296**, 223 (1992).

[19] S.B. Gerasimov,Sov.Jour. of Nucl.Phys. **2**, 430 (1966).

[20] S.D. Drell, A.C. Hearn, Phys.Rev.Lett. **16**, 908 (1966).

[21] V.M. Braun, *QCD Renormalons and Higher Twist Effects*, in the Proceedings of the XXXth Recontres de Moriond "QCD and High Energy Hadronic Interactions", Les Arcs, France (1995).